



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/579,947	05/26/2000	David T. Bagley	17911-14	8199

7590 01/22/2004

Marc E Brown Esq  
Oppenheimer Wolff & Donnelly LLP  
2029 Century Park East Suite 3800  
Los Angeles, CA 90067

EXAMINER

EDELMAN, BRADLEY E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 01/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/579,947

Applicant(s)

BAGLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Bradley Edelman

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 and 39-114 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 37,39-77,96-108 and 110-112 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,9-12,15-22,25,28-30,35,36,78,79,84-89,91,92,94,95,109 and 114 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7,8,13,14,23,24,26,27,31-34,80-83,90,93 and 113 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

As a result of a telephone interview with Applicant's representative on December 9, 2003, in which Applicant's representative notified Examiner of the priority status of the present invention (mentioned on p. 1 of Applicant's specification), the previous Office action mailed on October 6, 2003 is hereby withdrawn. It is replaced with this Office action. Thus, this Office action serves as a first Office action on the merits of this application. Claims 1-37 and 39-114 have been presented for examination (claim 38 was cancelled in a preliminary amendment). The claims have been restricted and elected according to the Election/Restriction requirement below. Thus, claims 1-36, 78-95, 109, 113, and 114 have been elected, and claims 37, 39-77, 96-108, and 110-112 have been withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to the non-elected invention.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-36, 78-95, 109, 113, and 114, drawn to a method and system for allowing a single string to be inputted into one of many applications, classified in class 709, subclass 245.
  - II. Claims 37, 39-46 and 110, drawn to a method and system for validating a string including a telephone number for use in an application, classified in class 379, subclass 90.01.
  - III. Claims 47-52, 111, and 112, drawn to a method and system for resequencing a string, classified in class 715, subclass 540.

Art Unit: 2153

- IV. Claims 53-65, and 96-108, drawn to a method for allowing a DNS to serve one or more sub-level domains, classified in class 709, subclass 249.
- V. Claims 66-77, drawn to a system and method for receiving a string, converting it to a telephone number, and resequencing the number, classified in class 379, subclass 142.13.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because it does not require the validity check described in the subcombination. The subcombination has separate utility such as validity checks of address strings in a single-application system.

Inventions I and III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because it does not require the resequencing steps described in the subcombination. The subcombination has

Art Unit: 2153

separate utility such as resequencing addresses for security purposes on a single-application system.

Inventions I and IV are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because it does not require a dedicated domain server for serving sub-level domain levels. The subcombination has separate utility such as selecting appropriate address strings in a single-application system.

Inventions I and V are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because it does not require the specific telephone functions described in the subcombination. The subcombination has separate utility such as a telephone set communication system.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for each group will be different in subject area and scope, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Rob Blackmon on September 24, 2003 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-36, 78-95, 109, 113, 114. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 37, 39-77, 96-108, and 110-112 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 5, 6, 9-12, 17, 35, 36, and 109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In considering claim 5, claim 5 recites, "said communication medium is selected from the group of homogeneous and of heterogeneous mediums." It is not clear how a group of mediums can be both homogeneous and heterogeneous. Thus, the claim language is ambiguous and must be corrected.

In considering claims 6 and 9, these claims contradict claim 1, from which they depend, and are thus unclear. Claim 1 requires that the plurality of different applications are of *different* types: "at least one communication application selected from a collection of different types of applications." However, claims 6 and 9 then state that "said communication applications include communication applications of the same type and/or same type but diverse formats." Thus, the recitation of applications "of different types" "of the same type" is confusing and contradictory. Correction is required.

Claims 10-12 depend from claim 9, and are thus rejected as well.

In considering claim 17, the claim is ambiguous and is thus unclear. The claim states, "wherein said communication medium is a homogeneous and/or a plurality of heterogeneous mediums." If the claim refers to only a single medium – i.e. "said communication medium," it is unclear as to how it can be a plurality of mediums.

In considering claim 35, the phrase "said corresponding valid address format" on lines 2-3 of the claim lacks sufficient antecedent basis. It appears that if the claim had depended from claim 31 instead of claim 30 it would have sufficient antecedent basis.

In considering claim 36, the phrase "said valid address format" on line 2 of the claim lacks sufficient antecedent basis. It appears that if the claim had depended from claim 31 instead of claim 30 it would have sufficient antecedent basis.

In considering claim 109, the phrase "said re-sequenced string" in the claim lacks sufficient antecedent basis. It appears that if the claim had depended from claim 23 instead of claim 22 it would have sufficient antecedent basis.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 28, 29, 92, and 94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vegvari ("Web browsers duke it out," April 1996, Computerworld, Vol. 30, Issue 15).

In considering claim 1, Vegvari discloses a system for communicating across at least one communication medium (i.e. the Internet), the system comprising:



A plurality of input subsystems (i.e. desktop computers) for receiving an address string (i.e. URL), the address string having a valid format recognized by the input subsystems and inputted into at least one communication application (i.e. browser) selected from a collection of different types of communication applications (i.e. web browsers) wherein the same address string can be validly inputted into any selected communication application from the collection (p. 1, Abstract, ¶¶1-2, wherein multiple types of browser applications are used to access the same World Wide Web using the same URLs).

In considering claim 2, Vegvari further discloses that the address string is associated with a recipient entity (i.e. the server associated with the URL).

In considering claim 4, Vegvari further discloses determining at least one communication medium based on the selected communication applications (i.e. upon using the browser, the use of the Internet is determined); and establishing communication across the determined communication medium based on the address string (i.e. an Internet communication).

In considering claim 5, as understood, Vegvari further discloses that the communication medium is selected from the group of homogenous and of heterogeneous mediums (this group necessarily includes all communication mediums, of which the Internet is a part).

In considering claim 92, Vegvari further discloses that the address is a registered domain name (i.e. URL).

In considering claim 6, as understood, Vegvari further discloses that the collection of communication applications includes communication applications of the same type (i.e. different web browsers).

In considering claim 28, Vegvari discloses a method for communicating across at least one communication medium (i.e. the Internet), comprising:

Receiving an address string (i.e. URL) inputted into a plurality of communication applications selected from a collection of different types of communication applications (i.e. one of a plurality of different types of web browsers) wherein the same address string can be validly inputted for any selected communication application from said collection (p. 1, Abstract, ¶ 1-2, wherein multiple types of browser applications are used to access the same World Wide Web using the same URLs).

In considering claim 29, Vegvari further discloses determining at least one communication medium based on the selected communication applications (i.e. upon using the browser, the use of the Internet is determined); and establishing communication across the determined communication medium (i.e. an Internet communication).

In considering claim 94, Vegvari further discloses that the string is a validly registered domain name (i.e. URL).

4. Claims 1-6, 15-22, 25, 28-30, 78, 79, 84-89, 91, 92, 94, 95, and 114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kelly (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,254).

In considering claim 1, Kelly discloses a system for communicating across at least one communication medium (i.e. PSTN or TCP/IP), the system comprising:

A plurality of input subsystems (i.e. telephones and computers) for receiving an address string (i.e. telephone number, or "1-561-997-4001@@provider2.com"), the address string having a valid format recognized by the input subsystems and inputted into at least one communication application (i.e. "WebPhone client application") selected from a collection of different types of communication applications (i.e. regular telephone application, "WebPhone 1.0, 2.0, or 3.0"), wherein the same address string can be validly inputted into any selected communication application from the collection (col. 6, lines 10-17, 59-67; col. 7, lines 5-19; col. 11, lines 51-59, wherein a user can either use a telephone to enter the telephone number address string, or can use the WebPhone client and enter the number using a computer).

In considering claim 2, Kelly further discloses that the address string is associated with a recipient entity (i.e. the recipient of the call).

In considering claim 92, Kelly further discloses that the address is a registered domain name ("domain name of '997.561.1.provider2.com").

In considering claim 3, Kelly further discloses a subsystem for recognizing that the input address has a different format than the format used by the communication application, and a mapping subsystem for converting the format into one utilized by the communication application (col. 12, lines 7-15, "the WebPhone client reverses the number and appends the carrier's domain name resulting in a hybrid telephone/domain name having the form '4001-997-561-1.carrier.com'" such that the address is "in an acceptable format for the name resolver protocol executing on a DNS name server").

In considering claim 4, Kelly further discloses a selector subsystem to determine at least one communication medium based on the selected communication application, and a communication subsystem to establish communication based on the address string across the determined communication medium (i.e. the system determines that an Internet connection is to be made when the user enters the address, and thereby communicates via the Internet).

In considering claim 5, Kelly further discloses that the communication medium is selected from homogeneous and of heterogeneous mediums (this group necessarily includes all communication mediums, of which the Internet is a part).

In considering claim 6, as understood, Kelly further discloses that some communication applications in the system can be communication applications of the same type (i.e. different versions of WebPhone).

In considering claim 15, Kelly discloses a method for communicating across at least two communication media (PSTN and TCP/IP), the method comprising:

Receiving an address string comprising at least a telephone number of a target entity and terminating in a top level internet domain (col. 13, lines 60-62, "1-561-997-4001@@provider2.com"), and inputting the address string into at least one communication application selected from a plurality of diverse applications (telephone application, "WebPhone 1.0, 2.0, or 3.0") wherein the same address string can be validly inputted for any selected communication application (col. 6, lines 10-17, 59-67; col. 7, lines 5-19; col. 11, lines 51-59, wherein any of the applications can use the address string to communicate).

In considering claim 16, Kelly further discloses a selector subsystem to determine at least one communication medium based on the selected communication application, and a communication subsystem to establish communication based on the address string across the determined communication medium (i.e. the system determines that an Internet connection is to be made upon address entry, and thereby communicates via the Internet).

In considering claim 17, as understood, Kelly further discloses that the communication medium is selected from the group of homogenous and/or a plurality of heterogeneous mediums (this group necessarily includes all communication mediums, of which the PSTN and TCP/IP networks are a part).

In considering claim 18, Kelly further discloses that the plurality of diverse communication applications include communication applications having the same or diverse formats (this necessarily includes all applications; also, the different versions of applications will have some of the same and some diverse formats).

In considering claim 19, Kelly further discloses that the communications application is a world wide web resource locator (i.e. a browser).

In considering claim 20, Kelly further discloses that the communication application is a telephone service ("WebPhone").

In considering claim 21, Kelly further discloses that the communication application is an electronic mail application (col. 7, lines 39-46, wherein the WebPhone client integrates user e-mail addresses for usage).

In considering claim 22, Kelly further discloses that receiving the address string further comprises recognizing that the input address has a different format than the

format used by the communication application, and mapping the string into a format utilized by the communication application (col. 13, lines 58-67, wherein the “@@” symbols and the dashes are removed).

In considering claim 25, Kelly further discloses that the address string consists of a registered domain name (i.e. “997.561.1.provider2.com”).

In considering claim 28, claim 28 contains no further limitations over claim 1, and is thus rejected for the same reasons stated previously.

In considering claim 29, Kelly further discloses a selector subsystem to determine at least one communication medium based on the selected communication application, and a communication subsystem to establish communication based on the address string across the determined communication medium (i.e. the system determines that an Internet connection is to be made upon address entry, and thereby communicates via the Internet).

In considering claim 30, claim 30 presents the same limitations as claim 3, and is thus rejected for the same reasons as claim 3.

In considering claim 94, Kelly further discloses that the address string consists of a validly registered domain name (i.e. “997.561.1.provider2.com”).

In considering claim 78, Kelly discloses a method of connecting a user's communication applications across at least two diverse communication media (i.e. phone and Internet) to a recipient's respective communication applications using a common address string, comprising:

Forming the common address string by combining the recipient's telephone number with a top level domain name (col. 14, lines 9-10, "1-561-997-4001@boca561.997provider2.com");

Inputting at least a portion of the common address string into at least two of the user's communication applications (i.e. phone or one of multiple WebPhone applications; col. 6, lines 20-23, 59-67);

Using the inputted portion to connect to the recipient's respective communication applications (i.e. the phone number is used to connect to a phone application, and can also be used to connect to the recipient's WebPhone application; col. 11, lines 51-64);

Wherein the communication media are chosen from telephone systems, world wide web resource locators, and internet browsers (cited above).

In considering claim 79, Kelly further discloses that the common address string forms a valid Internet domain name or sub-domain name ("1-561-997-4001@boca561.997provider2.com").



In considering claim 84, Kelly further discloses that the form of the registered Internet address is "telno.x.domain" (i.e. "1-561-997-4001@boca561.997provider2.com").

In considering claim 85, Kelly further discloses that the common address string also includes a dot-delimited subdomain (i.e. "1-561-997-4001@boca561.997provider2.com").

In considering claim 86, Kelly further discloses that a dot-delimited subdomain determines the communication medium (i.e. the "provider2.com" subdomain determines that the medium is the Internet).

In considering claims 87, Kelly further discloses that the second communication application is a www resource locator (i.e. WebPhone application).

In considering claims 88, Kelly further discloses that the second communication application is a telephone service (i.e. WebPhone).

In considering claim 89, Kelly further discloses that the second communication application is an electronic mail application (col. 7, lines 39-46, wherein the WebPhone client integrates user e-mail addresses for usage).

Art Unit: 2153

In considering claim 91, Kelly further discloses converting the valid address format into a valid email address format wherein the valid email address format comprises said valid address format preceded by an @ symbol and at least one character (col. 14, lines 3-10, wherein the phone number is converted to "1-561-997-4001@boca561-997provider2.com").

In considering claim 95, Kelly further discloses that the common address string is a registered internet domain name ("997.561.1.provider2.com").

In considering claim 114, Kelly further discloses that the valid, registered domain name is a top level domain (".com").

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 15-19 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vegvari, in view of evidence from the Internet Archive Wayback Machine ([http://web.archive.org/web/\\*/www.1-800-flowers.com](http://web.archive.org/web/*/www.1-800-flowers.com), hereinafter "WebArchive"), and further in view of Dillon (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,725).

In considering claim 15, Vegvari discloses a method for communicating across at least one communication medium (i.e. Internet), said method comprising:

Receiving an address string (URL) terminating in a top level internet domain (inherent in an Internet URL), and inputting the address string in to at least one communication application (i.e. browser) selected from a plurality of diverse communication applications (i.e. web browsers) wherein the same address string can be validly inputted for any selected communication application (p. 1, Abstract, ¶ 1-2, wherein multiple types of browser applications are used to access the same World Wide Web using the same URLs).

However, Vegvari remains silent regarding the syntax used in the address string, and thus fails to disclose that the address comprises at least a telephone number of a target entity. Furthermore, Vegvari also remains silent regarding the types of communication media used within the Internet medium, and thus fails to disclose that the method allows communication over at least two media. Nonetheless, both of these features are well known, as evidenced by WebArchive and Dillon, respectively.

In a similar art, WebArchive shows the use of the domain name 1-800-flowers.com as far back as 1996. Thus, the use of a telephone number as part of a URL address string is well known. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to place a phone number as part of an Internet URL in the system taught by Vegvari, so that companies who run websites could easily advertise their phone numbers to users.

Furthermore, in a similar art, Dillon discloses the use of multiple communication media in providing Internet access to users (Abstract; Fig. 1). Given this knowledge, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of providing communication to users of the Vegvari browsers over multiple communication media, so that the system is not limited to use on land-lines only. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use the telephone number as part of the URL, as taught by WebArchive, and to provide communication over at least two media, as taught by Dillon, in the system taught by Vegvari.

In considering claim 16, Vegvari further discloses determining at least one communication medium based on the selected communication applications (i.e. upon using the browser, the use of the Internet is determined); and establishing communication across the determined communication medium (i.e. an Internet communication).

In considering claim 17, as understood, Vegvari further discloses that the communication medium is selected from the group of homogenous and/or a plurality of heterogeneous mediums (this group necessarily includes all communication mediums, of which the Internet is a part).

In considering claim 18, Vegvari further discloses that the plurality of diverse communication applications include communication applications having the same or

diverse formats (this necessarily includes all applications; also, the different browsers will have some of the same and some diverse formats).

In considering claim 19, Vegvari further discloses that the communications application is a world wide web resource locator (i.e. a browser).

In considering claim 25, Vegvari further discloses that the string is a registered domain name (i.e. URL).

6. Claims 3 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vegvari, in view of Marshall ("Internet Explorer 5.0 Sports Search, Interface Tweaks," InfoWorld, Nov. 1998).

In considering claims 3 and 30, although the system taught by Vegvari discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it remains silent regarding address format-correcting features, and thus fails to disclose recognizing the inputted address as having a different format from the format utilized by the application, and mapping the format into a utilizable format. Nonetheless, such features are well known in Internet browsers, as evidenced by Marshall. In a similar art, Marshall discloses a browser that recognizes an input string that is not properly formatted to access the Internet (i.e. "http://") and maps it to a format usable to access the Internet (i.e. "http://") (see p. 2, ¶ 4). Given this knowledge, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of including the address formatting feature

Art Unit: 2153

taught by Marshall in the system taught by Vegvari, to increase ease-of-use of the browser (see Marshall, p. 2, ¶ 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the reformatting features taught by Marshall in the browser system taught by Vegvari.

7. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vegvari, in view of WebArchive and Dillon, and further in view of Marshall.

In considering claim 22, although the system taught by Vegvari, WebArchive, and Dillon discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it remains silent regarding address format-correcting features, and thus fails to disclose recognizing the inputted address as having a different format from the format utilized by the application, and mapping the format into a utilizable format. Nonetheless, such features are well known in Internet browsers, as evidenced by Marshall. In a similar art, Marshall discloses a browser that recognizes an input string that is not properly formatted to access the Internet (i.e. "http:/") and maps it to a format usable to access the Internet (i.e. "http://") (see p. 2, ¶ 4). Given this knowledge, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of including the address formatting feature taught by Marshall in the system taught by Vegvari, WebArchive, and Dillon, to increase ease-of-use of the browser (see Marshall, p. 2, ¶ 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the reformatting features taught by Marshall in the browser system taught by Vegvari, WebArchive, and Dillon.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 7, 8, 13, 14, 23, 24, 26, 27, 31-34, 80-83, 90, 93, and 113 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In considering these claims, the prior art of record fails to disclose or render obvious the specific translation, segmenting, and re-sequencing steps, as used within the claimed invention of claims 7, 23, and 31, and further fails to disclose the differentiating, stripping, and mapping steps, as used within the claimed invention of claim 80.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley Edelman whose telephone number is (703) 306-3041. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

For all correspondences: (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2153

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Bradley Edelman".

BE

January 16, 2004